

Community Service News

Vol. VIII May-June, 1950 No. 3

CONTENTS

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON THE SMALL COMMUNITY, JUNE 30-JULY 2

Announcement..... 66

Introductory Review of the Conference Topic..... 66

Background Articles:

The Community as Person..... 67

A Scientific Definition of Community..... 71

Family, Community, and the State, *Autonomous Groups Bulletin*.. 73

Professional Social Services and the Primary-Group Community,
by Arthur E. Morgan..... 80

Eugenics and the Small Community (Review)..... 84

COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

Are the Colleges Acquainting Students with the Community?
by E. L. Kirkpatrick..... 86

Goddard College and the Community, by Wilfrid G. Hamlin..... 87

Vermont Community College: An Experiment in Cooperative Education 90

REVIEWS

Rebuilding Rural America: New Designs for Community Life,
by Earle Hitch..... 91

Community Organization and Planning, by Arthur Hillman..... 91

The Community and Christian Education, by Tilford T. Swearingen.... 92

NOTES ON RECENT CONFERENCES

Inventory Conference of Kentucky Communities..... 94

North American Conference on the Community..... 94

CORRESPONDENCE 95

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES..... 96

Issued bimonthly except July and August by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. Subscription \$1.50 per year, two years \$2.50. 35¢ per copy.

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON THE SMALL COMMUNITY

THE PATTERN OF THE NEW COMMUNITY

Yellow Springs, Ohio—June 30-July 2, 1950

Community Service, Inc., invites all who are concerned about the future of community life in the small town and rural area to attend the Seventh Annual Conference on the Small Community, June 30-July 2. These conferences are a joint creation of all who attend. In the past attendance has been kept small enough so that members could become intimately acquainted with each other, and the conference benefits from the contributions of all its members.

Among those planning to attend and to assist in the leadership of the conference are the following:

Earle F. Allen, small business consultant,
Norwell, Mass.

Stanley Hamilton, executive secretary, Rural
Life Assn., Richmond, Ind.

Irwin T. Sanders, head, department of socio-
logy, University of Kentucky

Paul Keene, Penns Creek, Pa.

Norman Bittermann, executive director,
Southern Illinois, Inc.

Jan and Jess Ogden, directors, Community
Service Bureau, Extension Division,
University of Virginia

and the staff of Community Service, Inc.: Arthur E. Morgan, Ralph Templin,
Griscom Morgan, Alfred Andersen, Eleanor Switzer, and Richard Eastman.

Send applications and requests for information to: *Community Service, Inc.*, Yellow Springs, O.

Royce Pitkin, president, Goddard College,
Plainfield, Vt.

Benjamin F. Katon, farmer, Yellow Springs,
Ohio

E. L. Kirkpatrick, Marietta College,
Marietta, Ohio

J. P. Schmidt, supervisor, Community
Institutes, Ohio

J. J. Siemens, farmer, leader in Co-op Vege-
table Oils, Ltd., and other cooperatives,
Altona, Manitoba, Canada

INTRODUCTORY REVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE TOPIC

Only since awareness of the vital importance of the small community began to develop, thirty or forty years ago, has there begun to dawn upon us the need for a social structure which will preserve and encourage primary-group community values. Because we have identified the small community with agriculture, the public mind has assumed that interest in the small community is merely an attempt to turn back the pages of history. The need for a new pattern of small community life which will satisfy all the major cravings of the human spirit, and will be in harmony with the wholesome tendencies of modern life, is only now becoming generally recognized. What that new pattern will be like we do not see clearly. Much of the burden of attention of those interested in the primary-group community should be directed to an effort to define that pattern.

If there are some fundamental conditions which must prevail in any good social order, we should, if possible, know what they are. If there are conditions so in flux that no one can see what form they will take, it is well to recognize them.

This matter of achieving a consistent picture of over-all, long-time primary-group community objectives has been chosen as the subject of the Seventh Annual Conference on the Small Community. The following five articles, pertinent to this inquiry, may provide background for the conference.

THE COMMUNITY AS PERSON

Elsewhere in this issue we reproduce George Peter Murdock's sociologically objective and exact definition of community as one of the two universal social groupings of human, and of much of prehuman, society. The character of this universal group which he names "community" has involved living together in nearly all the activities of life in face-to-face relationships of groups not larger than a few hundred or at most several thousand in number. We use the word community for many meanings, but just as the word "family" is used in "the family of nations" without spoiling its use to designate a fundamental human social unit, so the use of the word community in other relationships should not destroy its clear and specific meaning as the name of a distinct and universal unit of human society.

Thanks to scientific exactitude in describing what until recently has been a universal characteristic of human living, we can know with assurance that in speaking of the small community we are not using an each-man-for-himself definition, nor are we speaking of a mystical and doubtful abstraction, any more than we do so in speaking of such a chemical compound as water. But we must do more than pin down the community as a fundamental grouping. We must establish in our minds the less obvious but no less real qualities and characteristics that make the community so essential a unit of human life, even for the future, just as in studying the nature of water we must recognize the less obvious elements that make it a substance eternally real in our experience.

One of the first essentials to understanding the community is a concept little understood by people under the domination of a highly disintegrated and individualistic culture. That concept is *personality*. The community—to the degree that it is a real community and not merely a group of people—has a being and spirit that lives of itself, although not apart from its members. In primitive communities that fact was partially personified in the gods of the community. Those gods were not only real in the minds of community members, but they represented something as objectively real as the individual in the community—the living personality of the community itself. So real is this "person" that when it dies members of primitive communities sometimes say, "We are dead." Just as a blow on the head will kill a dog, though most of its cells have been untouched, so a shock to a community often kills a community, though its individual members were not physically harmed at first. The disintegration of primitive communities on contact with more powerful cultures, and the following disappearance or great reduction of the population, is common knowledge.

Our national and world society is knit together by countless individual and group associations that cross community, city and national boundaries. This is true in science, religion, art, politics, business, education and in many other fields. Many such associations, particularly religious, develop some of the characteristics of community. Civilization depends upon these lines of intercommunication just as the human body depends on circulatory and nervous systems and other controls integrating and facilitating the function of cells and organs. This process of "extra-community association" in society, while it enriches and vitalizes the community, brings centripetal disintegrative forces into the home and the community, forces that must be balanced by centrifugal integrative forces that will maintain the unity and integrity of the basic units of human association. There can be no question of "either—or" about the specialized and the general relationships in society. Both are necessary for a high order of civilization.

Every person, every institution and every social group constantly seeks integration; that is, it seeks to bring all parts or phases into harmonious unity. The process of integration of social personality has been most penetrating and inclusive in the small community as it existed throughout human history until recent times. An isolated Pueblo Indian village is a surviving example. The life of the village is not divided into social, economic, religious and governmental functions. It is all one. Though integration on a far larger scale must also be achieved, and while other groupings are also necessary, the small community will continue to be a vital focus in which all areas of life and society must be integrated into a living social organism. Only when so integrated can men and groups of men find the basic social relationship and the emotional security and experience which they need.

The idea of attributing personality to the community is often resented because it is felt that if the community does have a life of its own that transcends the thought, personality and will of its members, it must then displace the integrity and freedom of the individual, becoming totalitarian on a small scale. This view is exemplified in the report of the Conference on the Community and Christian Education, by Tilford T. Swearingen, reviewed elsewhere in this issue. The conference acknowledged that society has "as its essential units, not only individuals and families, but communities." But the point of this recognition is largely lost in the subsequent statement: "It will be recognized throughout that the community must be changed and transformed because of its effect on people and not as an end in itself." Like individual people, for the community to develop fully and normally requires that it be loved for itself. To refuse the community such love causes it to decline and even to disintegrate as individual members and groups are drawn away by self-interest.

We are deeply obligated to one of the most valuable observations of anthropologists for an understanding of how individual and community integrity are consistent one with another. Many anthropologists have independently observed that the healthier and more stable primitive societies maintained a balance between the independence and integrity of the personality of the individual, and the integrity of the personality of the community. Both are ends. Neither oversteps the bounds of the other, just as in a strong healthy family the family is loved for itself. Parents respect the independence and personality of their children and all avoid domineering and possessiveness.

Thus we find that rather than destroying the freedom and status of the individual, in the long run the small community is his opportunity for freedom. For people do not generally have freedom over themselves or their environment except as they live in a community small enough so that they can share intimately in forming this whole life environment. Only through interrelation and integration on this small scale, and by the capacity thus developed for participation on a larger scale, can we have true democracy. In the absence of such participation learned at first hand on a small scale, democracy degenerates into a process of manipulation by "leaders."

The qualities of the age-old community have been thought of as applying to groups of any size, ranging to many millions. People cannot learn to love and live by abstractions. The bonds of real love begin in personal relationships and associations. "How can you love God whom you have not seen if you love not your neighbor whom you have seen?" Only by learning to love a knowable community can we by analogy extend such love to larger social units such as city, country or mankind.

In its economic life also we may compare a community to a family. It is generally recognized that a family needs an economy of its own, with its own budget and its own management. It must maintain sound relation between income and outgo, or it moves toward family poverty or bankruptcy. To whatever extent the state takes over the management of the family budget and family economy the independence and the cohesion of the family are destroyed, and it loses some of the essential quality of a family. This having a budget of its own does not in any way prevent the family being a part of a larger social unit with budgetary control on a larger scale. On the contrary, if each family competently manages its own budget, the financial burdens of the society will be much simplified.

Similarly a good community needs to have an economy of its own, not in isolation, but in relation to others and to larger social units. To the extent that the economics of each community is soundly managed by and within the community, the management burden of the state is reduced. Where the

community economy and its management are taken over by the state, the community loses an essential condition of its life, and tends to atrophy.

We repeat that from the requirement that each community have its own economy it does not follow that the community lives self-sufficiently or can dispense with participating in larger economic and social entities. But if the contradictions of our economy of scarcity in the midst of abundance are resolved by displacing the community economy with a welfare economy in which the state, or nationwide private corporations, take over most of the economic functions of the community, a vital element of the community disappears, and it ceases to be a whole and vital unit of human life.

It is commonly recognized that hardly any long-existing local communist economy permitted that freedom and integrity to the individual and group that is essential to a progressive society. For that reason the communism of the local community is not much more satisfactory than communism of the nation. The opposite extreme is also unsatisfactory. Unrestrained individual capitalism in the local community has been destructive to the community in the same way that nationwide uncontrolled capitalism has so often destroyed social harmony in the nation. Capitalism by definition concentrates the ownership and control of productive wealth and finance into the hands of a class distinct from the community even if in it. It is for this reason that crude capitalism has so commonly destroyed the community where its characteristic folkways have penetrated. The *Newsletter* of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, and Dr. Halliday's book *Psychosocial Medicine*, both reviewed in the May-June, 1949, *Community Service News*, give objective evidence of the effects of crude capitalism upon the community and its economy. We need a superior alternative to both crude capitalism and state socialism.

Similarly we can see influences toward community disintegration in present-day management of education and religion. Until recent times education and religion have been dominantly community functions and major foci of community life. Where school and church thrust their way into the community, undertaking to take over its general functions without regard for its whole personality, they weaken or destroy the community in proportion to their success, and in the process they reduce the value of their own work. The school has sought to compensate for rural exploitation and poverty by consolidation from the beginning of the school years in order to give more satisfactory teaching on a mass-production basis. It has often been assumed by school men that the small community could be displaced by larger impersonal masses which they continue to call the community. Some observers are finding that loss of intimate community oversight and influence is having harmful effects on children. The loss of the local grade school also

means loss of community experiences for many parents, and contributes to disintegration of community consciousness.

Religion is intrinsic to community. It has been said that the very topic of religion is individuality in community. The church, by considering itself as *the* community, has failed to recognize the integrity and autonomy of the personality of the community. It has considered the community as important chiefly as the environment of its charges, the church members. Seeking to displace the "person" of the community, it has weakened it and contributed to its disintegration. Jesus had preached the gospel of the kingdom of God in which both individual and community must "stand in judgment." However, the church commonly preaches the gospel only of individual salvation.

These are some of the more important age-old criteria of small community realization, and they suggest some of the causes of its breakdown. The question follows, is it realistic to employ those criteria in seeking to establish healthy communities in the future? If the community has been so vulnerable to the influences of our times, is there any reason to expect that it can again come into its own? Must it be attenuated by all the new developments such as suburban living, absentee capitalism, welfare state services and trends, loss of role in education and religion, and ever-increasing impersonalism, specialization, mobility and transience?

Essential as is the small community to a good society, it cannot stand alone against empire and exploitation. Where its isolation has been overcome without losing too much of its integrity—as has happened in Denmark largely because of the intercommunity folk school—the community has increased its strength through association and intercommunication, and has been the foundation of individual freedom and of national strength.

A SCIENTIFIC DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY

In stressing the vital and age-old characteristics of the small community we have been repeatedly reproached for dealing with a mystical intangible that is thought to be more a product of our enthusiasm than an objective and definable reality. It is fortunate that sociology is more and more making available to us results of scientific quantitative study which reveal the small community as a very definite and fundamental part of society.

It is a mistake for sociology to try to follow the example of physics and chemistry and to try to limit its findings to those which can be reduced to mathematical terms; but there are aspects of social life in which exact statistical and quantitative studies are invaluable. In his book *Social Structure* George Peter Murdock has sought, he writes, to demonstrate "that man's social behavior exhibits scientific regularities comparable to those established to date only in the most exact natural sciences." While the number of soci-

ological forms that are universal among men are limited, the fact that some of them are universal is highly significant. This is especially important to students of the small community. For the small community as we have conceived it is shown in Dr. Murdock's study to be one of the two fundamental and universal social groupings.

In *Social Structure* Professor Murdock gives some of the results of Yale University's cross-cultural survey (set in motion by Professor Murdock), in which data from 150 societies, primitive, classical and modern, were ordered and classified. From *Social Structure* we select for quotation parts of the section dealing with the community as a basic sociological phenomenon:*

The sociological term *community* is here chosen in preference to less definite or less descriptive alternatives, such as "local group" and "band," as the generic designation for groups organized on a predominantly local basis. It has been defined as "the mixed group of persons who normally reside together in face-to-face association."¹ *The community and the nuclear family are the only social groups that are genuinely universal.* [Italics added.] They occur in every known human society, and both are also found in germinal form on a sub-human level.

Nowhere on earth do people live regularly in isolated families. Everywhere territorial propinquity, supported by divers other bonds, unites at least a few neighboring families into a larger social group all of whose members maintain face-to-face relationships with one another. . . . The chances of survival thus seem to be materially enhanced through community organization, and this, together with the directly perceived gains, doubtless accounts for its universality. . . .

In size, the community at its lower limit, approached for example by the Reindeer Chukchee, consists of two or three families. The upper limit is seemingly set by "the practical impossibility of establishing close contacts with developing habitual attitudes toward any great number of people." (Linton, *Study of Man*, p. 218). For this reason, presumably, large urban aggregations of population tend to become segmented, when geographical mobility is not excessive, into local districts or wards which possess the outstanding characteristics of communities. A study by Goodenough² reveals a maximum range of from 13 to 1,000 in average community population, with 50 as the mean for tribes with migratory bands, 250 for those with neighborhood organization, and 300 for those with settled villages. The normal size of the community was shown by the same study to depend largely upon the prevalent type of food quest. . . . [While these numbers seem to be controlling in primitive cultures, under present-day conditions "community" might be maintained in groups several times as large.—G.M.]

**Social Structure*, by George Peter Murdock (New York, Macmillan, 1949, 387 pages, \$6.00), pages 79-80, 81, 82-83; reprinted by permission of publisher and author.

¹G. P. Murdock, C. S. Ford, A. E. Hudson, R. Kennedy, L. W. Simmons, and J. W. M. Whiting, "Outline of Cultural Materials," *Yale Anthropological Studies*, II (1945), 29.

²W. H. Goodenough, "Basic Economy and the Community" (unpublished article, 1941). This study, undertaken in the files of the Cross-Cultural Survey at the suggestion of Professor W. F. Ogburn, covered 40 tribes for which reliable population data were available.

The community appears always to be associated with a definite territory, whose natural resources its members exploit in accordance with the technological attainments of the culture. . . .

In consequence of its common territory and of the interdependence of its constituent families, the community becomes the principal focus of associative life. Every member is ordinarily acquainted more or less intimately with every other member, and has learned through association to adapt his behavior to that of each of his fellows, so that the group is bound together by a complex network of interpersonal relationships. Many of these become culturally patterned, yielding standardized relationships like those of kinship and those based on age and sex status, which facilitate social intercourse, and many are aggregated into clusters around common interests, forming groups such as clans and associations which help to bind the families of the community to one another.

Since it is mainly through face-to-face relations that a person's behavior is influenced by his fellows—motivated, cued, rewarded, and punished—the community is the primary seat of social control. Here it is that deviation is penalized and conformity rewarded. It is noteworthy that ostracism from the community is widely regarded as the direst of punishments and that its threat serves as the ultimate inducement to cultural conformity. Through the operation of social sanctions, ideas and behavior tend to become relatively [uniform] within a community, and a local culture develops. Indeed, the community seems to be the most typical social group to support a total culture. This, incidentally, provides the theoretical justification for "community studies," a field in which anthropologists, sociologists, and social psychologists alike have shown a marked interest in recent decades. . . .

United by reciprocal relationships and bound by a common culture, the members of a community form an "in-group," characterized by internal peace, law, order, and cooperative effort. Since they assist one another in the activities which gratify basic drives, and provide one another with certain derivative satisfactions obtainable only in social life, there develops among them a collective sentiment of group solidarity and loyalty, which has been variously termed syngenism, we-feeling, *esprit de corps*, and consciousness of kind.

FAMILY, COMMUNITY, AND THE STATE

What happens under the "welfare state" to the family, to autonomous associations of families, and to community, is described in a featured article by Kenneth Barlow, M.D., in the Winter (1949-50) issue of the *Autonomous Groups Bulletin*. Dr. Barlow has been associated with the Pioneer Health Center, or "Peckham Experiment," in London, England. In this article, "The Family and Autonomous Groups," he reviews the struggle of a similar inter-family project in Coventry—the Family Health Club Housing Society—to work out its own destiny. So significant is the experience of this group that we will quote parts of Mrs. Maria Rogers' foreword and of Dr. Barlow's

article. But first, we should like to draw attention to some of the community implications of this article.

The Committee on Autonomous Groups and the Pioneer Health Center have chosen units smaller than the small community as the area of their concern, in the first case the small group of congenial individuals and families, in the second case the family itself. Both recognize the community as important, but each is located in a metropolitan, urban environment—London and New York City. Hence they have little opportunity to deal with the small community as a fundamental unit of social and economic autonomy comparable to the family and the nation. They have sought primarily to safeguard and to build the freedom and integrity of the family and of the autonomous group. In the process they find their efforts vitiated by the fact that large governmental entities tend to be insensitive to autonomous family and group needs and points of view. In the absence of the small community that has a significant degree of social, economic and political integrity, the family and the autonomous group are isolated and greatly handicapped in mastering their own destiny.

The Autonomous Groups Committee has emphasized that the modern world's neglect and repudiation of autonomy of family, local fellowship and small community, were significantly products of social philosophers, dominantly influenced by cultural traditions. There is reason to believe that social philosophies, as that of Rousseau, as well as the trend elsewhere toward supremacy of the state, have been significantly results rather than causes. Just as Adam Smith in economic trends of his time foresaw developments that were in their infancy, so did Rousseau in the field of politics. The helplessness of the isolated small community to cope with empire, the vicious exploitation of class by class, the overriding of the local community economy by world-wide capitalism—these strong tendencies were observed by the eighteenth-century philosophers, including Rousseau, who therefore tried to explain them by a rational social philosophy.

We limit quotation from the *Autonomous Groups Bulletin* to a brief, representative and, we hope, coherent group of passages, because the *Bulletin* article is as long as it is valuable, and those who wish to read the whole had best obtain a copy of this issue (address Mrs. Ada Bull, 64 Clark St., Brooklyn, N.Y.; \$1.00 a copy, subscription \$2.00).

From the *Foreword*:

The family receives extensive treatment from social scientists, from apparently every angle, yet in all the voluminous literature, so far, they have paid little systematic attention to such matters as precisely how the modern family ties itself into the community emotionally, how its ties of friendship affect its capacity to fulfill the functions assigned to it in our culture, and how autonomous group relations affect these processes. Dr. Barlow's paper touches on these delicate and

highly significant subjects and is, as far as we know, the first which does so to be published in the United States. He agrees with a penetrating American observer that "unless it has supporting autonomous ties, the contemporary small conjugal family simply cannot stand, psychologically, the strains imposed on it by its effort to fulfill its functions in modern society." . . . Dr. Barlow's paper, with its recital of the fortunes and misfortunes of the Family Health Club Housing Society of Coventry, England, introduces to our readers clinical material of considerable value. . . .

One of our Committee members commented on this paper: "We have here ■ local community experiment operating on the local level within the governmental framework of a large-scale national community experiment. Both have 'social' objectives, but their methods are as widely different as autonomous local community organization differs from large-scale community administration. One gets the impression that this difference constitutes the Health Club's greatest problem. . . ."

The lack of understanding of autonomous groups exhibited by the British government, as recounted by Dr. Barlow, is matched by an equal lack of understanding on the part of other institutions, such as universities and philanthropic trusts. . . . The intellectual heritage of contemporary social practitioners has not provided them with a clear understanding of the ethical implications of autonomy for small groups. Like the rest of the members of this generation, their theories of social organization are generally inherited from eighteenth and nineteenth century thinkers whose ideas were, in turn, rooted in the European synthesis of Graeco-Roman-Christian cultures.

The most influential eighteenth century philosophers—Rousseau and his followers—contended that the independent individual is the primary, original social unit and that all his social ties—other than those of citizen-to-citizen—are of negligible importance socially and even positively inimical to freedom of personal development. . . .

The eighteenth century theory which thus relegated inter-personal relationships to limbo is no mere historical curiosity. It is still very much alive in 1950—not only in totalitarian countries, which naturally spring to the contemporary mind as examples, but also in countries calling themselves "progressive democracies."

It is of the utmost importance for social practitioners to know the origins of the unconscious assumptions which underlie their thought and action. These are for everyone the wellsprings of ethical convictions. Moreover, the hold of this eighteenth century theory on the contemporary mind can be more fully understood when we realize that it was superimposed upon, or derived from, a still older concept of the group, inherited from the Roman Empire and handed down to our day through both canon and secular law.

The attitude of the Roman Empire towards spontaneously-formed, voluntary groups can not be better summarized than in this quotation from Gibbon: "It is well known . . . that Roman policy viewed with the utmost jealousy and distrust any association among its subjects." . . . The Roman theory, to put it

baldly, was that the group derives its entity from the State, which can bestow or withhold, arbitrarily, its claim to existence. The State itself was conceived as ■ sovereign, single, irresistible authority, "inalienable, indivisible, and incapable of legal limitation." This meant that the life of a group was thought of, not as inherent and original, but as derivative and conditional. . . .

Our society teems with autonomous groups and their multiplicity makes encounters inevitable between them and social workers, community organizers, educators, and administrators of all types of institutions, including government. In consequence, the social practitioner is obliged *to act in relation to such groups*. Shall his behavior be moral or immoral?

To decide what is moral behavior and what is not, it is necessary to return to the principle that these groups possess inherent life. Our culture has evolved very definite concepts regarding the moral responsibility of each one of us vis-a-vis other living creatures. Life in Western culture has positive value, a sacred character. We know how we ought to behave towards another individual, whether our practice fully conforms to these ideals or not; but our training has not provided us with a moral code governing our behavior towards a *group* of individuals who have mutually chosen to associate together.

However, it does not take a great deal of imagination to see that if we *respect an individual* because he is alive, then because a group, too, is alive, we must *respect a group*, however few its members. If we feel constrained to aid in every possible way the efforts of an individual to grow and to develop his potentialities, then we must feel equal responsibility for the self-directed groups within which the individual grows and develops.

Dr. Barlow's story of an organization of families struggling for recognition of their right to autonomy in order to create an environment in which the laws of growth will be respected and obeyed gives us a hint of how necessary it is for us to develop institutional arrangements which recognize the right of groups to freedom and autonomy.—Maria Rogers

From Dr. Barlow's article, "The Family and Autonomous Groups":

Upon what happens when the family pushes out into the community depends the ultimate order of society and the general level of its culture—as disclosed in its manners, customs, and the achievements of its civilization. . . .

Each family has its own potential integrity. It is from within—spontaneously developed. Out of the order which is potentially within it, the family can answer the situation which confronts it and beget order therein. *To give freedom is to enable what is spontaneous to create an ordered habitation suited to its being.* Those who administer our institutional and governmental agencies have an obligation to allow each family power to build, not only itself, but *that part of the social order which its integrity requires and which requires its integrity.* . . .

But the initiative which must be taken by the family within the association of families has to operate, if at all, right across the set of contemporary ideas. There is a great need for some kind of association which will dedicate itself to the task of claiming for families the social right of shaping or managing the intimate circumstances which so vitally affect them. . . .

In present-day Britain, a vast reshaping of circumstances is afoot which does not take stock of the principles of action which are inherent in the family. The family is regarded as an institution with agencies—economic, social, and governmental—*do things to and for*. At no point is the family regarded as a unity which is to be trusted to do things for itself. Even when we are concerned with the question of the creation of new associations of family groups, as we are in all areas of housebuilding and town planning, *the initiative at present lies entirely outside the family and not within it*. . . .

Within this setting of ideas and circumstances, a family initiative was started in 1944 in Coventry, England. It eventually assumed the form of a Family Health Club Housing Society. The remainder of this paper will describe its fortunes and misfortunes. . . .

In 1944 there was much to do and it was reasonable and easy for families to feel that they could and should lend a hand. At that time a group of Coventry families first projected their family health scheme. Their aim was to recover the initiative in their own local and familiar circumstances. Their scheme had three main phases: dietetic, housing, and the cultivation of family development and health. . . . This unified service was to be directed quite deliberately to the cultivation of the principles of action inherent in the family and therefore in family development. It was proposed to call largely upon the experience of the Peckham Experiment in this endeavor.

The early experience of the Society confirmed immediately the strength of the appetite in many families to exercise their own initiative. The proposals met an immediate response. Six hundred and fifty families were enrolled. They quickly formed themselves into a Housing Society and thus secured the legal status requisite for the kind of project they envisaged. . . .

To meet the necessity, which the Society members at once recognized, of getting information about how to proceed, they formed themselves into small research groups to study the implications of their endeavors. These reported back to the body of the Society at short intervals. Through the intervening years between 1944 and 1949, when this paper is written, the members have met every week to watch progress and to take such steps as seemed useful and possible.

As another of the Society's aims is that of studying the efforts of its member families to establish a local community, they associated with their enterprise a scientist and a minister, whose function is, jointly, and from their several provinces, to interpret what is seen to happen among families in this process. . . .

The Society does not believe that its task is simple or easy. Equally it is of the opinion that modern experts have not yet the knowledge as to how it may be done satisfactorily. The problem is to grow the environment and the families in mutual synthesis. When a neighborhood unit is built, families are set in circumstances within which jointly and severally they must seek to grow their specific overlapping and interpenetrating zones of familiarity. . . .

Contemporary administrative orders, both governmental and institutional, are, however, unfortunately, generally inimical to the kind of group initiative for

which the Society stands. A brief review of its experiences in the fields of housing and health will demonstrate this.

By late 1946, the Society had been offered two farms. One of these it proposed to keep permanently for its food production: the other was to contribute part of the land required for its housing. Six hundred and fifty families planned ultimately to live in this territory—and to provide on that estate the kind of buildings and the kind of equipment which would give expression to the inner impulses of their family living.

Before the present social organization of Great Britain had been defined, the Society contacted the Liverpool Friendly Society, an institution with vast funds which at that time found difficulty in securing a suitable outlet for investments. The then treasurer persuaded his directorate to consider the proposals laid before him by the Family Health Club Housing Society and a tentative agreement to finance the projected housing was reached.

Shortly after this, the British Government declared its proposals for post-war housing. It secured, to the public advantage, that the cost of loans for house-building should be substantially reduced. But looking back after a period of years at the proposals then made, it is evident that they did not in fact leave room for family initiative. The government acted on political theory rather than on political fact. In theory, the municipalities are the custodians of family liberties. *In fact, they tend increasingly to become the local agencies of the central government and it is increasingly difficult for any local family to influence or shape their policies.* In a city such as Coventry, where sixty thousand families (a quarter of a million souls) are domiciled, it is impossible for the corporation to be responsive to the needs of each home's zone of familiarity.

In the matter of family initiative, the Society was very much a test case. It was a non-profit association of families seeking means to govern themselves, house themselves, and to create their own community. It embodied a deliberate attempt to suit the needs of a local society to the initiative of the families who comprised it. The Society at once inquired whether the government, either local or central, was prepared to acknowledge and support those aims. The passage of years makes it possible to answer that inquiry with precision. The answer has been No. The government favors the large municipal corporation in housing and is not prepared to recognize any association of citizens other than this, even though it be non-profit-making. . . .

The society was now to have further experience of the discrepancies which can exist between political intention and political practice. In the case of housing, the avowed intention of the government was to give the ownership and administration of new housing to the people. In practice their effect was to give it to the great municipal corporations and to preclude common people from using their own community associations for the purpose of managing their own circumstances. In the case of Town and Country Planning, the avowed intention was that the land values created by the community, who settled on the land where those values were created, should be reserved for the community of that place. In the case of this Act also, the Society represented a test case. Their

project envisaged that member families would be the future tenants of their estate. These families, through their own community association (which was what their Housing Society had become) would own the land and would create values on it. The question arose as to whether the Town and Country planning legislation would in their case recognize the institution which proposed to create the values or not. The broad general answer is that the Act gives no such recognition. . . .

It is now five years since action was first taken to initiate formation of the Society, and permission has at last been received to build two houses. The Society still has the confidence to assert that the prospects of a larger quota in the spring of 1950 seem to be good. . . .

When the Society was founded the shape to be taken by post-war medical services was not foreseen. It was thought likely that the promotion and the realization of positive health would be distinguished as separate provinces from those of the diagnosis and treatment of sickness. It was thought that some endeavor would be made to achieve a good quality human product in addition to servicing the breakdowns which occur in the sick. All these expectations have been deceived. No part of the vast budget now spent on medical services in Great Britain is in fact allocated to preventive medicine. The British Health services are exclusively concerned with sickness. . . .

Conclusion: Group Autonomy in the Post-War World

Up to the present, although the Society has sought assistance from Universities and from the great trusts and foundations, it has found at every point that these bodies are preoccupied with their departmental and fragmented concerns and find themselves unable to afford assistance.

Thus even in the seats of knowledge, where wisdom might be expected, sectarianism is everywhere dominant. Despite the high hopes generated during the war that "democracy" and freedom would be extended, the Englishman has failed to attain the standing which will enable him in fact to manage his own circumstances. The circumstances on which he must seek to operate are controlled from regions which in general he can not reach. The world which he and his family inhabit is not of his shaping. The Powers That Be are no familiars of his. It is not within the province of the family to exercise much in the way of powers at all. . . .

The organization of post-war Britain has grown up steadily and certainly. In the midst of it the family is more closely enmeshed than hitherto. The Family Health Club Housing Society now finds itself in a society wherein the need for family liberty and family association is desperately urgent. In that society, to secure what is so needed becomes continuously more difficult. The Family Health Club now has six hundred and fifty member families. Other families in other places are in no different position. When they seek to create circumstances favorable to the development of their living and their community, they obtain neither recognition, finance nor assistance.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL SERVICES AND THE PRIMARY-GROUP COMMUNITY

In a good primary-group community the members share their common problems and cooperate to meet the common needs. Except for services requiring special training, as in medicine, community social needs are met in large part by the voluntary work of members, and not by the employment of specialists. There is generally a fund of amateur, specialized skill to call on. In case of sickness or death or of juvenile misbehavior certain persons may be recognized as having particular wisdom, skill or experience, and are called on as the most helpful friends or neighbors under the circumstances. Something may be lost by the absence of more professional skill, but much is gained by the element of intimate acquaintance, of neighboring and friendship, and no amount of professional skill can replace folkways of effective living. Should this quality of voluntary, mutual self-help be lost, the very soul and spirit of the community would be lost or grievously injured.

There is no disapproval of professional skill as such. Physicians, teachers and ministers or priests are accepted as a normal part of primary-group community life, but they are most fully accepted when they are lifetime residents of the community and can be treated as friends and neighbors, and not chiefly as employed professionals. As community life takes increased advantage of modern knowledge the professional list is lengthened to include the librarian, the undertaker, the veterinarian and perhaps the recreation director. Other professions will be recognized and employed as circumstances indicate.

In the city the informal processes of mutual neighborliness tend to break down and pathological symptoms appear, taking the forms of unrelieved poverty, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, nonsupport of dependents, etc. These conditions call for the services of trained social pathologists. In answering to that need the profession of social worker has developed. As social pathology has increased, and as the public conscience has become more sensitive to its obligations, the social services have become more and more specialized and professionalized. The professional social service worker—social pathologist, social physician, or social technician under various titles—comes to think of his work as the normal way of dealing with all of society, including the primary-group community. Repeatedly the statement is made in social work circles that only paid, professional services are successful in

community organization, while yet the volunteer is sought as aid and assistant following professional methods. Professional treatment of social pathology comes to seem the proper and natural course for dealing with society in general, while the natural, healthy processes of the primary-group community—the spontaneous sharing of social needs and burdens—is looked upon as a crude vestige of primitive life, to be outgrown as rapidly as is feasible.

In line with this point of view the professionalization of social work progresses rapidly. The attitude grows that competence in voluntary and professional social work calls at least for college education, followed preferably by professional training, and supplemented by a period of a year or more of internship. There is a growing feeling in the profession that no one shall practice in a responsible position without having fulfilled these conditions. Volunteer work is encouraged, but under professional direction.

By the time a person is ready to practice he or she is past twenty-five years old. At that age one's underlying attitudes and intuitions are quite definitely fixed. To be at home in normal community relations one needs to begin much earlier. Intuitive wisdom and insight in human relations comes better from living in a primary group and from absorbing the traditional wisdom of the community, than by achieving a Ph.D. in community, and too commonly the Ph.D. has developed a deepseated "outsider" viewpoint, whereby condescension replaces sharing and fellowship. It is this consequence of the professionalization of community service, or its handling by a separate class of benevolent people, that roused Jane Addams to write much of her highly significant *Democracy and Social Ethics*. Throughout her book she called for the recognition that only by shared experience can we have healthy service, only through losing oneself in the community can one find his area of healthy participation in it. She wrote, "The danger of professionally attaining to the power of the righteous man, of yielding to the ambition for 'doing good' on a large scale, compared to which the ambition for politics, learning, or wealth, are vulgar and commonplace, ramifies through our modern life." Elsewhere she observes that identification with the common lot which comes only from sharing it "is the essential idea of democracy."

We have before us a booklet, *The Education and Work Experience of Community Organization Practitioners*, by Robert Irving Hiller.¹ It reports a study to determine the prevailing educational and professional preparation

¹Published jointly by the Association for the Study of Community Organization and by Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc., 155 E. 44th St., New York 17, N.Y., 1949, 61 pages, \$1.25.

of practitioners of community organization, with 266 professionals supplying the data. The following are some of the findings of this study:

"The male group ranging in age from 26 through 45 years constitutes 75% of the sample, and 82% of this group have 6 or more years of education [after high school]. The requirements in the field tend more and more to include a master's degree in social work."

"The practitioners with master's degrees in social work themselves generally agree that completion of social training on a graduate level is necessary; while nearly the whole group of practitioners indicate that it is either necessary or desirable."

"Most of the practitioners suggest that experience in a client-serving agency is necessary before beginning community organization practice."

If we make the distinction between primary-group and secondary-group communities in considering community organization work, a very limited number of the tasks of the community organizer fall within the range of working with the small community. It is interesting that of the eight types of community organization jobs that Arthur Dunham lists outside of the chest-council field,² all were dealing with dominantly large communities such as city, state and nation. Field representatives, conference executive, promotional agency, financial secretary and similar tasks might better be described as civic organization jobs than as community organization jobs.

A primary-group community is a social unit in which normally and characteristically people spend their lives together. In that process of living together there develops mutual acquaintance and understanding which seldom can result from brief sojourns. The sharing of burdens and the meeting of community needs can best grow out of long-time living together.

The typical professional community worker is not a member of his community, but is a sojourner. This fact is disclosed in the study referred to. Of the 266 cases studied by Hiller, "The average length of stay on a social work nonexecutive position for the practitioner in this study was from two to three years; while on an executive position, the practitioner generally spent about four years." It is said to be a recognized standard in the national organizations to reward good work by helping to find a new job in a larger city after about three years of service. Thus the relatively small town or city is not looked upon as an environment in which one will develop his roots, spiritual, social and economic, but as a stepping-stone to something "better."

The natural result of this policy is that the smaller places of work are drained of their ability and, except when serving as the temporary training

²*Job of the Community Organization Worker*, by Arthur Dunham. Published jointly by the Association for the Study of Community Organization and by Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc.

ground for young workers, they must be satisfied with the leftovers, who have not enough quality to deserve promotion. As this policy becomes the recognized type of action, to remain in a small place becomes evidence that one does not have the quality which would enable him to leave. Insofar as this policy prevails in the professions and other callings, it provides a sure formula for reducing the smaller social units to mediocrity. Since city families commonly survive but a few generations, we have here the perfect design for removing the quality from the source of population, and paving the way for national decadence.

The very existence of the primary-group community is menaced by the prevailing attitudes of the profession of social work, and by the assumption that those methods and attitudes are universally applicable to all forms of human association. Social patterns are strongly competitive. Any social pattern which has dominance of prestige, finance and entrenchment, may occupy the field even where it is a social liability. The profession of social work is today in that position with relation to social organization. It behooves those concerned with the survival and welfare of the primary-group community to distinguish clearly between the methods of action which are natural and appropriate to it, and the methods which have been made necessary by the failure of community under urban conditions.

This issue is vital, not only to the primary-group community, but to the continuance of democratic society. Professionalism in social relations and democracy do not thrive together. The professionalization of propaganda and of public relations are forging powerful tools for bureaucracy and dictatorship. The self-help of the normal primary-group community is the basic school of democracy.

There was a long period when the democratic process, clinging insecurely to the mountain recesses of Switzerland and Scandinavia, seemed like the last vestige of an obsolete way of life. Its resurgence leaves us thankful that it was not entirely exterminated. Similarly the primary-group community, though everywhere on the defensive against urbanization and centralization, is carrier of a precious inheritance for society. We do well to be aware of its values, and not to submerge them under the wave of professionalization of human relations.

—ARTHUR E. MORGAN

EUGENICS AND THE SMALL COMMUNITY

The inadequacy of the low birth rates of urban and professional people would be more obvious were it not for an illusion arising from the great decline in infant mortality resulting from modern medical services. For the great increase in survival through infancy and youth has been achieved at the expense of the weeding-out process that previously tended to eliminate infants and children with low vitality.

When we upset relationships that had previously existed universally in nature we need always to look for possible disadvantageous consequences—as when, in eliminating foxes, we give rise to a plague of grain-destroying mice. We now have strong evidence that we have a high price to pay for so extreme a reduction in infant mortality. With our civilized way of saving all children, the selective process involved in high infant birth rates will probably have to be replaced by deliberate social controls, or preferably social education, that will result in keeping a significant proportion of the population from sharing in the reproduction of the race. Such social controls will be far more difficult to achieve in an impersonal urban civilization than they were in the close-knit small community.

In "Mutational Prophylaxis," in the *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, and in "Radiation Damage to Genetic Material," in the January issues of the *American Scientist*, Professor H. J. Muller has given us authoritative accounts of how a fairly high and constant rate of degeneration affects genetic inheritance. He then proceeds to point out that nearly every mutation that is transmitted to a living child must eventually be weeded out by a failure to survive and reproduce in a future generation of descendants.

His discussion is based on the biological facts, generally accepted by geneticists, that in man, as in other species, there are constantly taking place some changes in the inborn or genetic makeup, called "mutations," which thereafter are inherited. These changes seem to be random—that is, good, bad and indifferent. Since in any complex organism there are many ways of going wrong to each way of going right, by far the greater number of these changes are disadvantageous. In nature they are gradually eliminated by the survival of the fittest. For instance, in all species there are repeated mutations in the structure of the eye. Those individuals with poor eyesight tend to be eliminated. In the dark of Mammoth Cave, where poor eyesight is no disadvantage, these unfavorable changes have been accentuated until the fish are blind. In modern society which saves children, good, bad, and indifferent, the results are somewhat like the effect on the sight of fish in Mammoth Cave.

If the weeding-out process of the survival of the fittest does not significantly take place through death in infancy and childhood to avoid human degeneration, it will eventually have to take place in adult life through eugenic measures deliberately avoiding procreation of substandard adults. It is not known what proportion of people once born will have to forego reproduction, but the number is so considerable as to necessitate a significantly higher birth rate than that which has been assumed to be necessary to maintain the normal population.

Professor Muller has calculated from the data that are now available that the number of new mutations transmitted to offspring in each generation probably amount to between one in ten and one in twenty. For the most part it cannot be determined whether or not a person should reproduce except in terms of his general vitality, including intelligence and some other intangibles. Since low vitality can arise from many other than purely genetic causes, Professor Muller suggests that the number of people who must refrain from reproducing each generation will probably be at least doubled, suggesting a possible rate of at least one in five that must not reproduce.

This new development in genetics has profound implications in the fields of sociology, education, medicine and many other fields. Above all it demonstrates how shortsighted and dangerous is our present policy of seeking to exploit to an extreme the creative powers and energies of superior people in other fields than physical labor, fully developed home and primary-group community life, and reproduction. In the past a large proportion of each generation were descended from a small proportion of very large families with above-average vitality. Intelligence and vitality was fairly evenly distributed among social classes. Today these eugenic relationships are being reversed until it is likely that urban civilization is exploiting our superior population for the works of civilization in much the same way as it has exploited our natural resources. Professor Muller's calculations indicate that the process of rebuilding our genetic inheritance may be far more difficult and slow than that of rebuilding forests and soil.

Another article in the Winter, 1950, *American Scientist* gives the result of a study of reproductive rates of women who had entered careers in science. The group of women scientists was found to have had a birth rate averaging about one child to every four women. Among married women working in science the average was .7 children per wife. It is significant that 41 percent of these married women attributed their low birth rate in part to physical inability to have more children. This ranked as the most important cause of low birth rate of the married women. Age of marriage ranked third in importance. The facts strongly suggest that this physical inability may result from overstress in the occupational field.

—GRISCOM MORGAN

COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

ARE THE COLLEGES ACQUAINTING STUDENTS WITH THE COMMUNITY?

At the recent North American Conference on the Community held at Columbus, Ohio, a staff member of one of our big universities proposed the establishment of a college for community education for the training of "generalist" leaders. At an institution of this type special attention would be paid to the training of young people for lay community leadership as well as to the development of professional community analysts and counselors.

Those of us who sat around a certain table, like a number of others at the conference, were wont to ask each other, why single out one or even a few colleges to do the job on community education? Moreover, shall not all of our many already established colleges and universities pay at least limited attention to education for actual living in the community?

Around the table referred to were representatives from three colleges in which an effort is being made to use the community as a "laboratory" for helping the student learn more about living. Each of these colleges is searching for ways of helping the typical college student to see that life is or still can be lived community-fashion, that his life is or can be a part of a community, and that he has an opportunity and a responsibility to "give and take" with others in situations where he is now or where he finds himself when through college. These colleges still maintain that old ideal, the liberal education, which is aimed at the training of generalists.

In how many American colleges is attention being given to this type of community education? We wish we knew.

Four or five years ago, effort was made to find out. More than 500 of the smaller colleges were written to. One out of five of them responded. Less than one half-dozen among those that responded were making an effort in this particular field; only a couple more were doing even wishful thinking. This seemed to call for more knowledge or information on the actual situation.

So, in connection with the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges (Cincinnati, January 14, 1948) a special session on college and community was arranged for. It was attended by some 60-70 college presidents, deans, sociologists or public relationists who set up a committee of five persons whose job it would be to seek further information on what is being done or anticipated, find channels whereby stories on developments or efforts might be directed to interested readers, and ferret out possible relations or connections with organizations or agencies that are concerned about the welfare and probable future of the American community.

During the past two years this committee has planned for and called several meetings. Two of these were held in connection with annual meetings of the Association of American Colleges (in January, 1949, and 1950). The others were in the nature of joint sessions (panel-discussion fashion) with the Ohio Valley Sociological Society (1948), and the Sixth Annual Conference on the Small Community (Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1949). More than 100 persons were reached through each of these two joint meetings. The two meetings held in connection with the Association of American Colleges meetings, although small, showed continuing interest and determination on the part of those present to keep pursuing the idea of a clearing house on aims, activity and accomplishments in community education among the colleges.

The committee uses a mimeographed news letter, which goes by request to 250 persons, as a means of stimulating interest and especially of getting leads for more pertinent information on what is being done or thought of in the various colleges.

Another effort and objective of the Committee is to get stories or articles on pertinent developments into the professional journals and general magazines. This necessitates our having first-hand materials in suitable story form from the institution and community wherein the project has transpired or is in operation, or preparing the story ourselves from materials that come to our attention. We feel, too, that effort to help the college or university see its opportunity and responsibility in training the student for living as well as making a living in the community is a gilt-edged educational investment.—E. L. KIRKPATRICK (Sociologist, Marietta College), Chairman of Committee.

GODDARD COLLEGE AND THE COMMUNITY

How does a small college on a Vermont hillside make itself part of its own community? What does it do about the surrounding world? The answer comes in two parts. The college goes out into that world, and it brings the world into the college.

People at Goddard don't become ingrown. Members of the faculty are active in Plainfield, Vermont, affairs. One student's studies in cooperative economics are supplemented by a job as manager of the local consumers' cooperative. A girl interested in nursery school work runs a town nursery school. A boy writes publicity for the state Mental Hygiene Association. In addition, the college's educational program requires that all students leave campus two months each winter to go to work.

The college brings to its campus all year, but in particular during the two winter months of the non-resident work term, the people of its wider communities: Vermont, New England, the country as a whole. They come

for two reasons which often overlap—to broaden their lives in a learning process, and to clarify problems which are bothering them. The various adult schools held at the college emphasize the learning part of this process: their aim is enrichment, understanding, the better way of life. The conferences emphasize problem-clarification; their aim is social diagnosis, increased awareness of problem areas, the resolution of conflicts.

In 1949 and 1950, Goddard's adult schools included the Summer Workshop, the Eastern Cooperative Recreation School, and the Vermont Labor School in the summer, and the Farm School and the School of Vermont Life and Traditions in the winter. They had in common their organization in small discussion, workshop, and studio groups, and their informal approach, but each was designed to serve a different purpose and to appeal to different groups.

Endorsed by various co-op groups in the East, the Cooperative Recreation School is, like all cooperatives, owned and controlled by its members, who find Goddard's atmosphere congenial to the project. The Vermont Labor School is unique in being supported by a per-capita tax levied on members of union locals which are part of the Vermont Industrial Union Council. Goddard faculty members staff the Labor School, which runs for a week.

The two winter schools appeal particularly to Vermonters. Young farmers, often couples, come to the Farm School for a week of discussion classes in such areas as economics, human relations, communications, science and living, and community problems. Areas such as these are not covered in the University Extension program, and those of the Farm School's members who have been to college have usually had only vocational training in agriculture. Testimony from former students shows that the questioning and learning which the school encourages go on long after the week is over.

The School of Vermont Life and Traditions centers around the history and the way of life which makes Vermont of importance to the country. The state's intellectual and natural resources are discussed and related to its way of life. Students coming from many professions and many different parts of the state find a fuller awareness of their own environment and its meaning.

Conferences at the college this year centered around two main problems of concern to Goddard's wider communities, education and community development. Education is a major interest of any educational institution; its way of life and its reason for being. Goddard has been concerned not only with its own educational efforts, but with the educational problems of the whole society. Its Conference on Current Educational Issues each year brings educators from all over the northeast (this year they numbered ■ hundred).

Education in Vermont was the particular concern of another conference, which brought school-board members, PTA officials, and other interested

citizens to discuss with each other and with members of the State Board of Education some of the problems they were facing in their local communities. At this conference a member of the state board mentioned the great contributions to public education in Vermont that Goddard's conferences on school problems have made.

An interest in community development has grown in Vermont for a number of years. Goddard has sponsored over a ten-year period the Vermont Citizens' Conferences, which meet each winter to examine some facet of the state's life. The 1950 conference topic was an examination of the citizens' responsibility in community development. Politicians and professionals might furnish an impetus or trained guidance, conference members felt, but the actual development of a community springs from the needs of citizens and rests ultimately with citizen groups.

This emphasis on citizen responsibility was carried further in 1950's Labor and Farm Conference, where farmers and laborers talked about ways in which community development might help solve some of their common problems, and in the Community Development Work Conference, bringing professionals who work in various development areas within the state to recognize the need for citizen participation in some sort of coordinated development work.

Other conferences on the 1950 winter program included a meeting of Vermont businessmen to talk about problems raised by the new Wages and Hours Law and by the influx of foreign imports; the Music Convention, which continues a traditional gathering of people in the neighborhood who like to sing; and a conference on "How Groups Work," sponsored by the Vermont Adult Education Association.

The Adult Education Association is one of the by-products of the Goddard winter conferences. Other organizations in the state whose family trees include Goddard as parent, grandparent, or close cousin are the Labor and Farm Council and the Vermont Cooperative Council, each in some senses unique. The Labor and Farm Council has done much to bring common understanding between two groups of Vermonters whose interests are traditionally opposed; the Co-op Council is one of the few state organizations which bring together both consumer and producer cooperatives.

Each year summer and winter programs involve directly about 500 people. The less personal results of attending them are more easily seen: the state's moves towards a study of its electric power supply, which have brought specific proposals for a Vermont Power Authority; the widespread interest in school consolidation, and the realization that the good school today is a community school, using its community and being used by it in ways which go far beyond traditional educational ideas; the growing understanding

between Vermont farmers and workers; the plans for coordinating development work in Vermont; the setting up of community and regional development associations, which cut across town and county lines.

The organization of conferences and schools and their sponsorship vary. The college sponsors some meetings; others are jointly sponsored and planned by Goddard and such groups as the Farm Bureau or the Vermont Development Commission. Still others are sponsored by groups outside the college but make use of its buildings and sometimes of its faculty.

Whatever the sponsorship, the conferences have in common certain techniques of group dynamics developed at the college before much concentrated social-psychological work had been done on the group process. Conferences meet in small groups to ensure active participation by every member, and experts are used as resource consultants rather than as lecturers. In each case a conference is aimed at diagnosis, clarification, and understanding of problems, rather than at immediate answers which must vary from individual to individual if they are to be meaningful ones.

Royce Pitkin, Goddard's president, says that colleges today have a responsibility which extends "beyond the walls of the school buildings into every city, town, village, and community." Carrying this responsibility, he believes, demands "the same kind of dedication and creative intelligence as the teaching of young people." This is the philosophy behind Goddard's community service; it's a philosophy which Goddard thinks might profitably be incorporated into the program of any college which genuinely wants to play its part in its society.—WILFRID G. HAMLIN, Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont.

VERMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE: AN EXPERIMENT IN COOPERATIVE EDUCATION

Vermont Community College offers mature persons an opportunity to study together at a reasonable cost through living simply and cooperating in the household chores and in the operation of a small farm. The college believes that the people's college, as developed in Denmark, can be successful in America and that it can be an invaluable social experience.

The purpose of the college is the examination and evaluation of, and participation in modern society. The college will provide courses in the social sciences, literature, semantics, fine arts, mathematics, and one of the sciences.

The two sessions of the college (from Sept. 10 to Dec. 10 and from March 15 to June 15) provide a long winter and summer work period for students who are self-supporting. Those interested in further information should write: Vermont Community College, Calais, Vermont.

REVIEWS

Rebuilding Rural America: New Designs for Community Life, by Earle Hitch (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950, 273 pages, \$3.50).

When one is working alone on a job which he thinks is very significant, but which seems not to have public support or interest, it is encouraging to find that other people have discovered the same or similar interests, and are also at work. Such a discovery adds to one's sense of validity and sanity. Many individuals over our country have ideas and vague plans for daring undertakings in the way of community development and integration, but with a feeling that these are so different as to be "out of this world." Then, when they come across a book like *Rebuilding Rural America*, they find that in many places just such projects as they have in mind are already under way. That, in our opinion, is perhaps the chief value of this book. Quite a number of the projects described have been unknown to the general reader.

A chief criticism of the book is that it is uniformly laudatory, and not critical. A discriminating discussion of each of the projects, including accounts of elements of failure, with the reasons, so far as they can be determined, would have added greatly to the value of the book, and perhaps would have been equally stimulating to persons who were considering whether to undertake some project.

The last two chapters, "The Support for the Movement," and "Sources of Further Information," answer questions raised in a large number of the inquiries received by Community Service, Inc. They provide a convenient directory in the field of community development. The book is available from Community Service, Inc.

—ARTHUR E. MORGAN

Community Organization and Planning, by Arthur Hillman (Macmillan, New York, 1950, 378 pp., \$4.00).

Arthur Hillman, professor of sociology at Roosevelt College in Chicago, has contributed a highly usable addition to the growing stock of tools for the community worker. He started out to bring harmony between the separate fields of community organization and planning. The former has tended to be the private preserve of the social welfare profession. The latter has often been dominated by engineers, traffic experts, architects, and other designers of physical facilities. In bringing the two diverse fields together, Hillman has gone beyond both to rediscover the small social unit in which inter-related participation is possible. "Any community is a localized group with some degree of social interaction and common interests." In going on into the large city, he keeps his eye focused upon the small unit in neighborhood or

block and examines the way in which human values may be enhanced in the broad process of planning.

Inevitably Hillman re-examines the relationship between citizen and expert. The voice of the citizen is found in the community council which stresses broad participation. American naïve reliance upon "leaders" is criticised in an analysis of the type of leadership needed for participation in councils. "It has been suggested that 'central person' be used for the role of catalyst involved in dynamic leadership, as distinguished from the stereotyped notion of decisive inflexible action of the 'strong' leader."

The author comes down to earth in discussing processes of democratic planning as related to services for the young, social work, recreation, race relations, and other special purposes. He proves himself most practical in the exhaustive lists of references and resources, carefully classified as to utility. Though the book exhibits scholarly competence, it should prove useful to those "central persons" who are actually taking responsible roles of leadership in many communities.

The surest proof of a book is in the reading. We have tried out Hillman's text on students whose critical judgment has been sharpened by realistic experiences in communities with which we work. These students, both American and foreign, have found the book clarifying.—WILLIAM W. BIDDLE, Director, Program of Community Dynamics, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana.

The Community and Christian Education, by Tilford T. Swearingen (St. Louis, Bethany Press, 1950, 159 pages, \$2.00).

This is a report of the conference on this subject by the International Council of Religious Education held at Columbus in December, 1947. A suitable title for the book might be, "The Church Discovers the Community." We read: "Individuals and families have long been viewed as essential units of a good society, but the concept of *community* as another important unit has yet to be exploited." "The main stream of the Christian movement seems to have passed by the *community*." "Anything that destroys the sense of human value, that detracts from the inherent sacredness of the person, is inimical to all that we say we believe in and are striving for in a Christian civilization. The increasing destruction of *community* in America is thus a peril to Christianity and to democracy. We praise our democratic ideals and institutions; but we forget that they grew out of the experience of community life, in which people lived together long enough to know each other, and as a result were able to build up orderly, self-governing communities.

"A contributing cause of the destruction of community life is the operation of institutions within communities which draw upon its life but contribute little or nothing to it. Even the church may function as a divisive, self-centered, noncreative force within community life."

The book includes one of the best discussions of the nature, place and functions of the community which we have seen. Then follows a discussion of how the church can be helpful to the community and be helped by it. One of the "specific agreements" of the conference is that "No single institution within the American community can in itself be the center of community life." The concept that the various social units in the community should contribute to the total life and quality of the community and its members, and should not disrupt the community to create little competing communities of their own, is an important addition to social thinking in the religious field.

Then follow well written chapters on "How to Hold a Community Conference" and "Outcomes to Be Expected." The concluding chapter, "A Community Philosophy," is somewhat of an anticlimax to a good book. In the appendix we read: "It is time that Christians established the habit of religious inquiry as a folkway of their community; that truth-seeking together and devotion to the truth be defined as an essential activity of community living." The concluding paragraphs are typical: "Jesus was not concerned about formal organizations, but the spirit of human helpfulness among all people was to him all-important. From the very origin of the Christian Church, its life has been inseparably related to the task of creating community."

When we consider that this volume is the outcome of a conference representing a wide spread of denominational boards and of other church groups, the surprising result is not that there are vestiges of a spirit of church monopoly of ethical and spiritual direction, but that a spirit of critical inquiry is so much in evidence. The book shows imagination and vigor of insight and purpose.

—ARTHUR E. MORGAN

Three fifths of the American people moved between 1940 and 1947; two fifths moved from one neighborhood to another; one fifth moved far enough to cross a county line. Farm population declined in this period by a net 3,200,000.—Conrad Taeuber, of F.A.O.

NOTES ON RECENT CONFERENCES

THE INVENTORY CONFERENCE OF KENTUCKY COMMUNITIES Louisville, January 26, 1950

Throughout the conference it became increasingly evident that the Committee for Kentucky had rendered an inestimable service to its citizens. The fruits were there to show it: heart-warming stories of local community groups "doing with what they had at hand . . . without running to the state . . . through hard work and cooperation." And as the group listened to the closing speech by Harry Schacter the feeling was in the air that here was a sincere man, who took an ideal which was within his powers of realization and made it socially alive in an entire state.

It is now clear why it is well for the Committee for Kentucky to disband. New vision is needed, and more participation. The work thus far has been financed largely by Louisville businessmen and overwhelmingly directed by one of them. This explains much of the metropolitan, top-down atmosphere of the conference, with no audience participation and an unbalanced emphasis on material values. But the spirit was good, the approach sincere, and one could almost feel Kentucky growing in stature and self-respect.

The creative leaders of Kentucky are not concerned about the end of an organization, useful as this one has been. "Kentucky people don't work that way," said Irwin T. Sanders, professor of sociology at the University of Kentucky. "They think more in terms of individuals appropriate to the tasks as they arise. Who can best do this job?" But Dr. Sanders agrees that a need has been demonstrated for a state-wide "community council." He feels that it will come into being in due time, and it seems inevitable if Kentucky's marching is to be centrally purposeful; because Kentucky is truly awakened and inspired.

—ALFRED ANDERSEN

NORTH AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON THE COMMUNITY Columbus, Ohio, April 12-15, 1950

Representatives of diverse groups interested in developing the quality of community across the country attended this conference. The national organization of Community Chests and Councils, colleges whose students study rural communities, planners for cities up to 3,000,000, and national labor unions were part of the wide range of background and special interests. A binding element was the desire to develop the spirit of community in their respective areas.

One significant fact was brought to the fore, that there are many cities too large to provide necessary services and organization adequately by volun-

tary participation and too small to support specialists in each of the needed areas. At either end are the cities large enough to provide support and small communities where mutual activities are sufficient. In this inbetween city, people whose training is broad are needed.

Much of the conference was devoted to the discussion of training leadership for community. A discussion group on this topic came to the conclusion that training servants of the community to perform assignments of the community is a legitimate need. However, to train people to be "community leaders" was felt to expose us to the dangers of developing a "leader class." In groups we choose our leaders (who do need training), but there is no assurance that our choice will coincide with an individual's training.

So far as training is concerned, this discussion group felt that it would largely fall into two areas, a broad education for citizenship and the developing of skills and attitudes for servants of communities. While some were disposed to dismiss "professional leader" vs. "servant" as a semantic difficulty solely, others felt keenly that there are two distinct concepts, the former hindering development of community qualities and the latter aiding that development.

Though participants frequently did not recognize the significance of primary-group relations in their work in urban areas, the more successful endeavors presented as examples were developed on the basis of such relations. The Conference did show how much workers in public service projects need understanding of the small, primary-group unit to give significance to their work. The Conference's value to the small, non-urban community is not likely to be great.

—RICHARD EASTMAN

CORRESPONDENCE

The essence of *community* is the community *spirit*. What requires a religious zeal and fervor will never be accomplished by purely secular methods. In the absence of a recrudescence of religious faith the community movement will fail. I do not mean a catholic faith, but such faith as is promoted in great strength and variety by the small sects of America.

Many, and among them myself, are disgusted with some aspects of a too narrow sectarianism. Many of us cannot accept conscientiously the theology of the middle ages, and I see no reason

why we should. But to throw out the baby of religious faith with the bathwater is another matter. I write as a religious independent. I have no axe to grind for any creed, cult or ism; but I recognize the value of a religious faith in promoting the aims and ideals of *community*.

Variety of religious experience, training, and education should be encouraged: while, at the same time, doing everything possible to promote religious tolerance and respect for other faiths than one's own. — Donald E. Hare, Washington, D.C.

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

May 12-17. Citizens Planning Conference, Am. Planning & Civic Assn., Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C.

June 6-9. Stillwater, Okla., conference sponsored by Foundation for Integrated Education and Oklahoma A and M College; general chairman F. S. C. Northrop. Apply to Foundation headquarters, 60 E. 42nd St., New York 17.

June 15-18. Sixth Annual Institute of Community Leadership, Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y. Write New York State Citizens Council, 601 E. Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y.

June 18-July 1. National Cooperative School for Group Organization and Recreation, Mission House College, Plymouth, Wisconsin. Courses in theory, art, music, puppetry, dancing, dramatics, games. Write Ellen Linton, Box 57, Greenbelt, Md.

June 25-July 14. National Training Laboratory in Group Development, Fourth Session, Bethel, Maine. Write N.T.L.G.D., 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

June 30-July 2. Seventh Annual Conference on the Small Community, Yellow Springs, Ohio. See announcement on page 66.

July 17-29. English Town and Countryside Today, a Sociological Field Study for United States, Overseas and British Students; headquarters at Le Play House, Ledbury, Herefordshire, England. For information write Mrs. A. Farquharson, Institute of Sociology, Le Play House. Other field studies planned for Denmark and the Pyrenees in August.

July 23-30. Recreation Institute. Danebod Folk School, Tyler, Minn.

July 3-Aug. 11. Summer Workshop on Good Schools and Teaching, Goddard College, Plainfield, Vt. For information write A. R. Elliott, Jr., Director of Adult Education. Also

at Goddard, July 1-August 12: Summer Music School and Festival, Vermont Conservatory of Music.

August 13-16. American Society of Planning Officials, Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles, Calif.

August 5-26. Third Annual Summer Session, the Grundtvig Folk School. Theme "A Mid-Century Perspective." Seminar in history and life sciences. Special features nature hikes, sketch classes, folk singing. Living expenses about \$5 a week, camping facilities abundant. For information write headquarters at Box 218a, Route 1, Eagle Creek, Oregon.

August 11-12. Cooperative Health Federation of America, Fourth Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington, following C.H.F.A. Institute August 9-10. For information write headquarters at 343 S. Dearborn, Chicago 4, Illinois.

September 3-7. XIVth International Congress of Sociology, Rome, Italy. First such congress in ten years. Subjects include: the social units; the village; the town; the village and the town; the methods of sociology; the social research institutes; the teaching of sociology; the future dynamism of the population; social metabolism; sociology in the ancient world; etc. For information write President of the Organizing Committee, c/o Societa Italiana di Sociologia, Via delle Terme di Diocleziano, N. 10, Rome.

ADVERTISEMENT

For Rent—summer or longer, nice, primitive 8-room house located on large farm. Facilities for livestock and garden. Isolated, quiet, beautiful, with woods, large stream and mountain near by. Three congenial, religious-minded families work farm cooperatively. Inquire of Paul Keene, Penns Creek, Pa.

Community Service News, issued bimonthly except July and August by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio, \$1.50 per year, two years \$2.50. Griscom Morgan, editor.

Community Service, Inc., is an organization to promote the interests of the community as a basic social institution, concerned with the economic, recreational, educational, cultural and spiritual development of its members. Community Service was incorporated in 1940 as a non-profit organization to supply information and service for small communities and their leaders, in the belief that the decay of the American community constitutes a crisis which calls for steady and creative effort. The nation-wide interest expressed during the succeeding years has reinforced this opinion.